The Trials Of Alexander Economou

By VennerRoad, 7th Aug 2016

In December 2012, Alexander Economou took a stunningly attractive young woman to bed. He is still counting the cost.

Alexander Economou

In December 2012, Alexander Economou met Eleanor de Freitas, and took her to bed. Although this appears to have been only the second time they had met in the flesh, they'd had quite a correspondence over social media, so this was not really a one-night stand, although it turned out to be a one-off. Although he was rich, handsome and a catch, she was some twelve years his junior, and a trophy girlfriend if not a potential trophy wife, stunningly attractive, with personality, and *breasts to die for*.

Sadly, if a woman sounds too good to be true, she probably is. Unless her name is Candice Night!

Whatever, after she exhibited some strange behaviour, Economou ran her name through his search engine, and didn't like what he found, so he broke off their relationship. At the very worst that is the behaviour of a cad, but men who wear expensive suits are entitled to have higher standards; whether or not she was actually a fully fledged prostitute, he considered her one. This may be the Twenty-First Century, but if he had been a police officer or a civil servant, someone would have whispered in his ear words to the effect that he would have to choose between his career and his girlfriend.

Her best response would have been to tell him good riddance or simply goodbye, and find herself another lover; okay, she may have had to lower her standards, but she wouldn't have been alone for long. Instead, she decided if he didn't have her, he would have no one else, because after badmouthing him for over a week, she went to the police and told them he had drugged her, falsely imprisoned her in his apartment, and raped her. These are serious allegations for which even a man of good character could expect a seven or perhaps a ten year sentence on conviction. In the United States he would be looking at considerably more, and even with a plea bargain could expect to spend a decade behind bars.

As our legal system has been gutted by spineless politicians under pressure from largely feminist fanatics, no corroboration is now required for a rape conviction, and as a plethora of disturbing cases has shown us in

recent years, even those who are famous as well as rich are sitting ducks for demented or simply malicious females.

Alexander Economou was arrested and bailed pending further inquiries. Dissatisfied with the way he believed the police to be handling the case, he decided to carry out his own investigation. His major discovery was CCTV footage of the two of them shopping *after* the alleged rape. The film is not great quality but it is clear that she was under no duress. This is compelling evidence of dishonesty on her part, and it appears to have led to the police dropping the case.

Economou's concern may seem exaggerated to a disinterested party, but as was pointed out in a recent article, there are men worldwide who would have been sentenced to thousands of years of prison time but for CCTV evidence, and in some of those cases the police have either failed to investigate properly or simply missed it. See in particular the remarkable case of Andrew Bond, and that of falsely accused teenager Matthew Hilliard.

Feeling both vindicated and more than a little angry, Economou demanded the prosecution of his false accuser. The police declined to charge her with perverting the course or justice or with anything else, so he initiated a private prosecution. Again, while many men would have been prepared to let sleeping dogs lie, he was not, and as he had the means as well as the determination, he succeeded. Eleanor de Freitas was charged with perverting the course of justice. Had the case come to trial, she would surely have been convicted, whereupon she would probably have been sentenced to at most a year in a cushy women's prison where she would have been able to

wear make-up, read, watch television, and while away the six months or so she would actually serve.

If he had been convicted, he would have been looking at years behind bars, perhaps segregated from other inmates, forced to sign the sex offenders register for life, and (in his eyes) been forever disgraced. Let us not mention any future relationships with women. This is the reality for both men convicted of rape (rightly or wrongly) and false rape accusers so convicted.

Alas, Eleanor de Freitas did not experience prison life, because shortly before the start of her scheduled trial, she committed suicide. Obviously this was a tragedy of epic proportions, and one nobody, including Alexander Economou, wanted to see. There this sad tale might have ended but for another equally obsessed individual, the usual suspects, and the specious narrative of the sexual grievance industry parroted for the most part uncritically by the mainstream media.

In the eyes of David de Freitas, his only daughter was the victim; she had done nothing wrong, so should never have been prosecuted, and in any case she was mentally ill, vulnerable. He gave a series of interviews about the case, and he was not the only one. On May 22 last year, Lisa Longstaff of Women Against Rape appeared on a BBC news programme wherein she claimed that at the time of her death, Eleanor de Freitas was being prosecuted by "her rapist". Although she didn't name him, who else could she have meant?

Likewise, David de Freitas seems to be of the opinion that if a man is accused of rape then he is guilty regardless of any exculpatory evidence. In his public pronouncements

he called for a second inquest into his daughter's death, and continually blamed the CPS. They should, he said, have taken over the prosecution and dropped it rather than pursue it.

A grieving father who courts publicity will naturally receive more sympathy than a man whose main claim to fame is that he was arrested on suspicion of rape, even if he has never been charged, and while no doubt for Mr de Freitas this was a cathartic exercise, for the man who had spent an estimated £200,000 on clearing his name, it was akin to it continually being dragged through the mud, and he decided the only way to put a stop to it was to sue for defamation. Before that trial though he was to face another one, this time a criminal trial with himself in the dock, because after issuing the writ against David de Freitas, both the man himself and his solicitor Harriet Wistrich complained to the police that he had been harassing them. This was clearly an attempt to stay the defamation proceedings, and anyone who knows anything about Miss Wistrich will understand her motives. She is an uncritical supporter of an organisation called Justice For Women. No one should be deceived by this flowery rhetoric, the women this organisation has supported include Zoora Shah – who poisoned her lover with arsenic; Jane Andrews – who battered and stabbed her lover to death; and teen head case Stacey Hyde who stabbed a man to death. Miss Wistrich actually acted for Hyde, who was bizarrely cleared at a retrial, another so-called vulnerable woman. *

In short, Miss Wistrich is one of those *wimmin* who deny the very existence of female evil. Here is a more objective

view of this murderess Miss Wistrich has helped turn loose on an unsuspecting public.

***R v Economou* was heard at Horseferry Road on May 26-7 this year, and resulted in an acquittal. The case of *Economou v de Freitas* was heard before a judge at the High Court the following month, and sadly did not deliver justice. The judgment of Mr Justice Warby runs to 260 paragraphs. Had this case been heard under the *Defamation Act* 1996, the plaintiff would certainly have won; under the *Defamation Act* 1952, it would have been a no-brainer, but under the new legislation the plaintiff must prove *serious harm*. This is an incredibly subjective judgment. There is so much defamatory material in cyberspace, especially YouTube, and much of that so insane that it is best to simply ignore it. Does anyone outside the craziest of the crazies really believe George W. Bush ordered 9/11 or that the Queen of England controls the international drug trade?**

Rape though is, or can be, different. Bill Clinton has been accused of many crimes, including numerous rapes, and at least one of his accusers has been given mainstream media coverage, but again, no one who matters pays attention. On the other hand, the hysteria generated over the equally vacuous Cosby allegations ran and ran, including in the mainstream media.

All the same, it is difficult to credit the plaintiff in this case has suffered no damage at all. Even if that damage has not been financial, it has certainly been psychological, because it has caused him to obsess over his reputation to begin with. The reality is that Eleanor de Freitas is still being alluded to as the victim in this sad affair rather than the

perpetrator. Indeed, the word vulnerable appears in the judgment no fewer than fifteen times, but nobody is simply vulnerable. Everyone on Earth is in theory vulnerable to an asteroid strike; at the time of writing much of France and many other European nations are vulnerable to random terrorist attacks. Eleanor de Freitas was vulnerable to what, precisely?

She was an adult, living an independent life; much has been made of her mental condition, but much was made of Stacey Hyde's mental condition, so much so that after a retrial she was cleared of murder on the grounds of self-defence after stabbing her victim in the back! In other words, the word vulnerable prefixing a woman's name should be a get out of jail free card. Does any rational person agree with that statement? But it gets worse. Only on July 9, the campaigning group Inquest which claims to be working closely with David de Freitas wrote:

This case raises many issues of public interest including:
Use of private prosecutions against rape complainants
The prosecution of rape complainants whose rape/sexual offence allegations are not pursued for perverting the course of justice
Depriving protections available to rape complainants (such as anonymity) when the complainant becomes a defendant in a PCJ prosecution, thus potentially putting potentially genuine complainants at risk.

Failing to follow guidelines for prosecuting mentally disordered defendants
The issue of 'rape myths' e.g. disbelieving complainants who do not conform to stereotypical behaviour and whose

behaviour both before and after the alleged offence is inconsistent.

Eleanor de Freitas was not a rape complainant, she was a false rape accuser. The suggestion that a woman will face prosecution if the man she accuses of rape is found not guilty, is not tried or not even charged is wilfully misleading. We are not talking here about the legal terms *reasonable doubt* or *insufficient evidence*, we are talking about demonstrable lies.

Ditto the second paragraph. How does a false rape accuser being stripped of her anonymity put genuine rape victims at risk? Anonymity should not be granted to accusers period unless there are children involved or if the accused is a celebrity/well known in which case he should be granted anonymity too, otherwise all manner of cranks, chancers and damned liars can crawl out of the woodwork, something that gives duplicitous prosecutors the opportunity to present this as a pattern of offending.

As for the issue of rape myths, this is as good as branding the accused guilty all over again. Eleanor de Freitas was seen happily shopping with him after the alleged rape though before he broke up with her, but we should not stereotype her behaviour. The only problem with this is everything. Here is the dynamic American defense attorney Demothenes Lorandos explaining the fallacy of rape trauma syndrome. In a nutshell the accused is *crimen exceptum*, in other words guilty by dint of the allegation because no evidence can ever be adduced to refute it.

While it is true that not all genuine rape victims behave in a stereotypical fashion, the same is true of those falsely accused. Soap actor William Roache was magnanimous in

the extreme to the liars who had they been believed would have led him to spend the rest of his days behind bars. The magician David Copperfield set up a small dedicated website to tell the truth about his false accuser, who went on to falsely accuse another man. Singer-songwriter Conor Oberst issued defamation proceedings against his Internet accuser, who eventually retracted. Professional dancer Michael Flatley pursued his false accuser to the full extent of the civil law. And...teenager Jay Cheshire hanged himself after being told no further action would be taken; Stephen McLaughlin killed himself *after* his false accuser was convicted; rugby player Luke King committed suicide four years after he was cleared. All young men whose lives were trashed thanks to the machinations of evil, manipulative little tarts.

Anyone who has studied the Economou case and especially anyone who has spoken to him will realise he is far closer to these last three than to Michael Flatley.

Returning to David de Freitas, the only person responsible for his daughter's death was herself. He has blamed the CPS and of course the real victim. It must be stressed again that Alexander Economou is totally blameless in this affair, as is Alison Saunders, who has rightly come in for much criticism in the past, especially with regard to rape cases, but if Mr de Freitas is intent on blaming a living person for Eleanor's suicide, he should look much closer to home, because he cannot have been unaware of the salient fact that Alexander Economou was not the first man she had accused of rape. Indeed she had accused her own parents of both holding her prisoner and trying to poison her. Actions have consequences, even for fruit loops. The idea that a woman should not be held to

account because she has mental health issues, or because she is young, attractive and white with big tits, is not the way our criminal justice system works. Indeed, women, especially young women, already get away with murder thanks to the sexual grievance industry, in the case of Stacey Hyde, literally.

*** The stunningly attractive but clearly toxic Stacey Hyde was found dead in April 2024, aged just 32, apparently by her own hand. Sometimes, what goes around does indeed come around.**

https://www.infotextmanuscripts.org/wikinut/wikinut-the-trials-of-alexander-economou.html